

SECRET

DD/S&T#1092-16/

2 MAR 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ADDI

SUBJECT: ADDS&T Views on USIB Restructuring Draft

1. I have several comments on various parts of the draft which are enumerated below. Most of these comments relate to the recommendations made as to specific USIB committees. I agree with the general line that the NIB should be established as a body advisory to the DCI, charged with only substantive matters and distinct from the CFI.

2. The following comments are directed to the material in the Annex but obviously apply to the appropriate recommendations of General Walters' memorandum.

a. I agree on COMEX.

b. In the COMIREX discussion, it seems to me that it is necessary to distinguish committee structure from the staff. I am convinced that the Committee and its sub-committee structure are necessary, as is the implementing staff. I agree with your paragraph (a) but think it needs to make the point that the Chairman of COMIREX and his immediate staff and the Executive Secretariat will be guided by the COMIREX Committee. In paragraph (b) I concur with the staffing recommendations and indeed would urge that that be done in NPIC which has the charge to perform services of common concern in this area. But once again, I think it must be made clear that these staffing components will be guided by the appropriate sub-committees of COMIREX. It would be appropriate that the staff chiefs were sub-committee chairmen reporting to COMIREX and its Chairman. This may be what you have in mind in paragraph (c) but I think it is confused by the lack of distinction between staff and committee roles. Finally, I see no reason for the EXSUBCOM, ICRS, and the COMIREX ADP coordinating group being a part of the NIB structure. They should continue to be sub-committees of the COMIREX whose Chairman reports to the CFI.

c. My basic problem with the paper is exemplified in the statement on page 4 in the section dealing with the Human Resources Committee to the effect that sub-committees which are substantively oriented should be retained in the NIB. In my view, it is critically important that substantive people be engaged in providing guidance directly to the CFI where it provides the basis for making resource decisions. Perhaps my problem comes from the fact that the staffing elements and the committee structure are

SECRETE 2 IMP DET
CL

SECRET

again not adequately differentiated. It may well be that some part of the Secretariat of the HRC should reside in the CIA to provide services of common concern, but nevertheless I believe that the HRC should be responsible to the CFI and its Chairman located in the IC Staff.

d. My views in regard to the SIGINT Committee match those regarding COMIREX and the Human Resources Committee. I believe the SIGINT Committee and all of its sub-committees should report to the CFI.

e. I believe that the solution which seems to have been adopted for the Security Committee is ridiculous and it should be located within the IC Staff.

f. The IHC should have a large and very significant role to play. I agree that it has not and is not doing that job. I believe it should be made to do so. In any event, it should report to the CFI.

g. I agree with the recommendations that the EIC, STIC, JAEIC, the SALT Monitoring Group, etc. be part of the NIB structure.

3. Finally, perhaps my difficulty comes with your designation of staff functions as part of the NIB structure. It seems to me that staff functions can be located in organizations outside of the IC Staff where they will perform services of common concern in support of a Committee structure supporting the CFI without their ever having to become a part of the NIB structure. I don't really understand this line at all. Committee participation on the part of substantively oriented people can take place in full support of the CFI without compromising the independence of the intelligence production functions from the CFI or the IC Staff.

SECRET